

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

PLEASE REPLACE FIG. 8 WITH THE ATTACHED REPLACEMENT SHEET

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended herein. This Amendment, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated February 26, 2008, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

I. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to Figure 8 and asserts that it should be designated by a legend because only that which is old is illustrated. As a path of least resistance, Figure 8 has been appropriately amended, and Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Examiner's concerns have been fully addressed. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

II. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification asserting that line 3 of page 6 should be amended to change " $W_a < W_b$ " to " $W_a > W_b$ " because lines 27-30 of page 8, recite " W_a being larger than W_b ". The Examiner has also objected to the specification because it refers to the claims. As a path of least resistance and in the interest of clarity, the specification has been appropriately amended to address all of the Examiner's concerns. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the recitation " $W_a < W_b$ " is a typographical error and should be corrected to " $W_a > W_b$ ". As a path of least resistance,

claim 12 has been appropriately amended to address all of the Examiner's concerns.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

IV. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 8, 9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Japan 407 (JP 07-223407). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites:

“A pneumatic tire sequentially including on an outside of a crown part of a carcass extending in a toroidal fashion a belt and a tread section, which is provided with grooves, and having different negative ratios of the tread section on each of two sides of a tire equatorial plane, wherein

a belt width Ba from a belt end on the higher negative ratio side to the tire equatorial plane and a belt width Bb from a belt end on the lower negative ratio side to the tire equatorial plane satisfy a relationship of:

$Ba > Bb$, and

the belt width Ba and a grounding width Tin from the tire equatorial plane to a grounding end inside of a camber satisfy a relationship of:

$1.0 \leq Ba/Tin \leq 1.1$.”

Japan 407 is directed to a pneumatic radial tire. Japan 407 shows a radial tire having a reinforcing belt and a tread part surface with two or more slots. *See* Paragraph [0006].

Further, the tread part surface appears to have different negative ratios on each side of a tire equatorial plane. *Id.* However, Japan 407 does not teach or even suggest “the belt width Ba and a grounding width Tin from the tire equatorial plane to a grounding end inside of a camber satisfy a relationship of: $1.0 \leq Ba/Tin \leq 1.1$.” For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the applied reference. Further, Applicant submits that claims 3, 8, 9 and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 8, 9 and 12 be withdrawn.

V. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japan 407. Further, claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japan 407 in view of Matsumoto (US 2002/0100526) and Baumhofer et al (US 6,439,286; henceforth “Baumhofer”). Further, claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japan 407 in view of Japan 511 (JP 2002-225511). Further, claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japan 407 in view of Mezzanotte (US 4,848,429) and Japan 105 (JP 62-059105). Further, claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Japan 407 in view of Mezzanotte (US 4,848,429).

Claims 2, 4-7, 10, 11 and 13 all depend from claim 1, which has been shown above to be patentable over the Japan 407 reference. None of the other references cited by the Examiner cure the deficiencies of the Japan 407 reference because none of the references teach the unique features recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4-7, 10, 11 and 13 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880 via EFS payment screen. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/SMG/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Steven M. Gruskin
Registration No. 36,818

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 24, 2008